

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF OKLAHOMA**

SHAQUILLE O. WILLIAMS, )  
                                )  
Plaintiff,                 )  
                                )  
v.                            )  
                                ) Case No. CIV-24-00068-SLP  
FNU GREER, et al.,        )  
                                )  
Defendants.                )  
                                )

**O R D E R**

Before the Court is the Report and Recommendation [Doc. No. 9] issued by United States Magistrate Judge Amanda Maxfield Green upon referral of this matter, *see* 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B) and (C). In the Report and Recommendation (R&R), Judge Green recommends that the Court dismiss this action for failure to show cause why this action should not be dismissed as duplicative of Plaintiff's simultaneously filed action, *Williams v. FNU Greer, et al.*, Case No. 24-67-SLP (W.D. Okla. 2024).<sup>1</sup> *Id.* at 1-3. Judge Green advised Plaintiff of his right to file an objection to the R&R on or before April 15, 2024, and that failure to object would waive his right to appellate review of the factual and legal issues addressed in the R&R. *See* [Doc. No. 9] at 3-4.

Plaintiff has filed numerous documents since the R&R was issued on March 25, 2024, none of which are an objection to the R&R or otherwise relate to Judge Green's

---

<sup>1</sup> As fully explained in the R&R, the Complaints filed in this action and Case No. 24-67-SLP name the same Defendants and involve the same three legal claims based on the same alleged facts. *Compare* [Doc. No. 1] at 1-9; *with* Case No. 24-67-SLP [Doc. No. 1.] at 1-9.

recommendation to dismiss this action as duplicative. *See* [Doc. Nos. 10, 11, 12, 13, 14].<sup>2</sup>

In one of those filings, styled as a “Notice of Right to Object,” [Doc. No. 12], Plaintiff references the April 15, 2024 deadline to object to the R&R and appears to request additional time. *See id.* at 1. But the additional time sought is to obtain transaction history for his inmate trust account, which relates to his in forma pauperis application in the other case rather than the R&R in this action. *See id.*

As such, no objection to the R&R has been filed, nor has an extension of time in which to object to the R&R been sought or granted. Therefore, the Court finds Plaintiff has waived further review of all issues addressed in the R&R. *See Moore v. United States*, 950 F.2d 656, 659 (10th Cir. 1991); *see also United States v. 2121 E. 30th St.*, 73 F.3d 1057, 1060 (10th Cir. 1996).

Accordingly, the R&R is ADOPTED in its entirety, and this action is DISMISSED WITHOUT PREJUDICE.

IT IS SO ORDERED this 13<sup>th</sup> day of May, 2024.



---

SCOTT L. PALK  
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

---

<sup>2</sup> One of those filings is an Amended Application to Proceed in Forma Pauperis [Doc. No. 13], which appears to have been erroneously filed in this action in response to an Order entered in the other action. *See* Case No. 24-67-SLP [Doc. No. 7]. Plaintiff also filed a “Notice” [Doc. No. 14] in this action which relates to the deadline set forth in that same Order in the other action. This apparent confusion between the two actions only further convinces the Court the present action is duplicative, and dismissal is appropriate.